arXiv:1603.05526v1 [math.LO] 17 Mar 2016

DESTRUCTIBILITY OF THE TREE PROPERTY AT $\aleph_{\omega+1}$

YAIR HAYUT AND MENACHEM MAGIDOR

ABSTRACT. We construct a model in which the tree property holds in $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ and it is destructible under $\mathrm{Col}(\omega,\omega_1)$. On the other hand we discuss some cases in which the tree property is indestructible under small or closed forcings.

1. INTRODUCTION

A partial order $\langle T,\leq_T\rangle$ is called a *tree*, if it has a minimal element and for every $t\in T$, the set $\{s\in T\mid s\leq_T t\}$ is well ordered by $\leq_T$. The order type of the chain of elements that lie below t in the tree order is called the *level* of t and denoted by $\mathrm{Lev}_T(t)$. For a cardinal κ, T is called a κ-tree if $\sup_{t\in T}(\mathrm{Lev}_T(t)+1)=\kappa$ and the cardinality of each level of T is strictly below κ.

By a theorem of Kőnig, every ω-tree has a cofinal branch (namely, a cofinal chain). On the other hand, a theorem of Aronszajn states that there is an ω_1-tree that has no cofinal branches. Such a tree is called *Aronszajn tree*. For any larger successor cardinal, $\kappa>\omega_1$, it is independent with ZFC whether there is κ-tree with no cofinal branches. This question is related to other combinatorial topics and in order to get the consistency of the non-existence of κ-Aronszajn tree, one must assume the consistency of some large cardinals. If every κ tree has a cofinal branch, we say that κ has the *tree property*.

By a theorem of Silver, if uncountable cardinal κ has the tree property then κ is weakly compact cardinal in L. On the other end, Mitchell proved that if κ is weakly compact cardinal and $\mu<\kappa$ is regular then there is a generic extension in which $\kappa=\mu^{++}$ and the tree property holds at κ, thus showing that the tree property at double successor of regular cardinal is equiconsistent with the existence of weakly compact cardinal. Where κ is a successor of singular cardinal, the situation is more complicated. In [3], Magidor and Shelah showed that it is consistent, relative to some large cardinals, that the tree property holds at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$. The large cardinals assumption was later reduced by Sinapova and Neeman to the existence of an ω-sequence of supercompact cardinals (see, e.g. [4] for the Prikry-free version). In both constructions, $\aleph_1$ plays a special role. It reflects, in some sense, the properties of $\aleph_{\omega+1}$.

In section 3 we will show that it is consistent to have a model in which the tree property holds at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$, but after collapsing $\aleph_1$, it fails. This extends a work by Cummings, Foreman and the second author [2, Theorem 14]. In this paper they show that it is possible that a weak square is added by a small forcing. Our arguments are very similar to the arguments there. In [5], Rinot shows that it is consistent that there is no special Aronszajn tree on $\aleph_{\omega_1+1}$ and a σ-closed $\aleph_2$-Knaster forcing of cardinality $\aleph_3$ introduces one. We note that we do not know how to apply a similar argument for this case.

In section 4 we discuss three cases in which the tree property at a successor of a singular cardinal is somewhat indestructible. In 4.1 we will show that it is consistent that the tree property holds at $\aleph_{\omega^2+1}$ and it is indestructible under any forcing of cardinality $<\aleph_{\omega^2}$. In 4.2 and 4.3 we will show that the tree property at

$\aleph_{\omega+1}$ can be made indestructible under small σ-closed forcings or arbitrary large $\aleph_{\omega+1}$-closed forcings.

2. Preliminaries

The following notation, due to Magidor and Shelah [3], plays an important role in the investigation of the tree property at successors of singular cardinals.

Definition 1. Let λ be a regular cardinal. A *system* is a triplet $\mathcal{S} = \langle I, \kappa, \mathcal{R} \rangle$ such that:

(1) $I \subseteq \lambda$ unbounded. $\kappa < \lambda$.
(2) $\mathcal{R}$ is a collection of partial order relations on $I \times \kappa$.
(3) Each $R \in \mathcal{R}$ is a tree like partial order. R respects the lexicographic order on $I \times \kappa$. Namely, $\langle \alpha, \zeta \rangle R \langle \beta, \xi \rangle$ implies $\alpha \leq \beta$ and if $\alpha = \beta$ then $\zeta = \xi$. Moreover, if $\langle \beta, \xi \rangle, \langle \gamma, \rho \rangle R \langle \alpha, \zeta \rangle$ and $\beta \leq \gamma$ then $\langle \beta, \xi \rangle R \langle \gamma, \rho \rangle$.
(4) For every $\alpha < \beta$ in I there are $\zeta, \xi < \kappa$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $\langle \alpha, \zeta \rangle R \langle \beta, \xi \rangle$.

A *branch* through $\mathcal{S}$ is a set of elements on $I \times \kappa$ which is a chain relative to some $R \in \mathcal{R}$. We say that a branch b meets the α-th level of $\mathcal{S}$ if $b \cap \{\alpha\} \times \kappa \neq \emptyset$. A branch is *cofinal* if it meets cofinally many levels.

A system $\mathcal{S}$ is *narrow* if $\kappa^+, |\mathcal{R}|^+ < \lambda$.

Definition 2. Let λ be a regular cardinal. We say that the *narrow system property* holds at λ if every narrow system of height λ has a cofinal branch.

Unlike the tree property, the narrow system property is indestructible by any small forcing. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a forcing notion with $|\mathbb{P}|^+ < \lambda$ and let $\dot{\mathcal{S}}$ be a name for a narrow system. Let $\dot{\mathcal{R}}$ be the collection of names of relations in $\mathcal{S}$ and let I be the set of all ordinals that can be levels of the $\mathbb{P}$. Let us define the narrow system $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ in the natural way: the relations of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ are indexed by $\mathbb{P} \times \dot{\mathcal{R}}$, and let $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle (p, R) \langle \gamma, \delta \rangle$ iff $p \Vdash \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle R \langle \gamma, \delta \rangle$ for $R \in \dot{\mathcal{R}}$. A branch in the system $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ corresponds to a condition $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and a set of element in $\mathcal{S}$ which are forced to be a branch in the generic extension by p.

3. Destructible tree property

Theorem 3. *Let $\kappa = \kappa_0 < \kappa_1 < \cdots$ be an ω-sequence of supercompact cardinals. Then there is a forcing extension in which the tree property holds at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ and the forcing $\mathrm{Col}(\omega, \omega_1)$ adds a special Aronszajn tree.*

We will prove something slightly stronger. We will define a forcing poset that force that in the generic extension there is a partial weak square on $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ whose domain contains all ordinals with cofinality above ω_1, while the tree property holds at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$. If we further extend the universe and collapse ω_1 to be countable, then we can complete all the missing ordinals in this square sequence by just adding an ω sequences. By a theorem of Shelah and Ben-David [1], without violating the continuum hypothesis at $\aleph_\omega$, we cannot hope to have this kind of partial square with only one club at each ordinal. Our partial square will be quite wide.

Let $\mu = \sup \kappa_n$ and let $\lambda = \mu^+$.

We begin with some definitions:

Definition 4. A partial square on a set $S \subseteq \lambda$ with width $< \eta$ is a sequence $\mathcal{C} = \langle \mathcal{C}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ such that:

(1) For every $\alpha < \lambda$, $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$ is a set of cardinality $< \eta$. If $\alpha \in S$ then $\mathcal{C}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$.
(2) Every $D \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$ is a closed and unbounded subset of α and $\operatorname{otp} D < \alpha$.
(3) If $\beta \in \operatorname{acc} D$, $D \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$ then $D \cap \beta \in \mathcal{C}_\beta$.

When $\lambda = \mu^+$, we may assume that $\operatorname{otp} D \leq \mu$ for every $D \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$.

Since successor ordinals are never accumulation points of a club, the values of the square sequence at successor points are irrelevant. We will assume that $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha+1} = \{\alpha\}$ for every α, for consistency.

We want to force a partial square for the set $S^\lambda_{\geq\kappa}$ with width $< \mu$.

Definition 5. Let $\mathbb{S}$ be the following forcing notion. A condition $s \in \mathbb{S}$ is a sequence $s = \langle c_i \mid i \leq \gamma\rangle$ for some ordinal $\gamma < \lambda$ such that all three requirements for the partial square sequence hold for every $\alpha \leq \gamma$. Namely,

(1) $\forall \alpha \leq \gamma$, c_α is a set of less than μ sets. If $\operatorname{cf}\alpha \geq \kappa$, then $c_\alpha \neq \emptyset$.
(2) For every $D \in c_\alpha$, $\operatorname{otp} D \leq \mu$ and D is a closed and unbounded subset of α.
(3) If $\beta \in \operatorname{acc} D$, $D \in c_\alpha$ then $D \cap \beta \in c_\beta$.

We order $\mathbb{S}$ by end extension.

We will think on the conditions $s \in \mathbb{S}$ as functions, so for $s = \langle c_i \mid i \leq \gamma\rangle$ we will write $\operatorname{dom} s = \gamma + 1$ and $s(i) = c_i$ for $i \in \operatorname{dom} s$.

Lemma 6. *$\mathbb{S}$ is κ-directed closed.*

Given a partial square $\mathcal{C}$, we will define a threading forcing, $\mathbb{T}_\eta$. This forcing will add a club at λ with order type η such that all its initial segments are from $\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 7. Let $\mathbb{T}_\eta = \{D \mid \exists \alpha,\ D \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha,\ 1 < \operatorname{otp} D < \eta\}$, ordered by end extension.

The following lemma is standard:

Lemma 8. *Let $\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}_\eta$ be as above. Then:*

(1) *$\mathbb{S}$ is λ-distributive.*
(2) *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the generic partial square added by $\mathbb{S}$, and let η be a regular cardinal. $\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}_\eta$ is equivalent to an η-closed forcing. Moreover, for every $\rho < \mu$, $\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}^\rho_\eta$ (where we use full support power in $V^{\mathbb{S}}$) contains an η-closed dense subset.*

Proof. Let us show that $\mathbb{S}$ is λ-distributive. We will show that it is η-strategically closed for every regular $\eta < \lambda$. We will do this by showing the second part of the lemma – that $\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}_\eta$ contains a η-closed dense set.

Let us observe first that the set of conditions $\langle s, \check{t}\rangle \in \mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}_\eta$, $\operatorname{dom}(s) = \gamma + 1$, $t \in s(\gamma)$ is dense. For every condition $\langle s, \dot{t}\rangle$, $s \Vdash$ "$\dot{t}$ is a member of some set in the square sequence" and therefore $\dot{t}$ is forced to be a member of the ground model.

Thus, there is an extension of s, s', which decides the value of $\dot{t}$ to be equal to an element in V, that we will denote by t. t might have no extension in $s'(\max\operatorname{dom} s')$ but we can extend s' to s'' where $\operatorname{dom} s'' = \operatorname{dom} s' + \omega + 1$, and t has an extension in the top element of s''. Let call this extension t'. Thus we have a condition $\langle s'', t'\rangle \leq \langle s, t\rangle$ and $\langle s'', t'\rangle$ has the desired form.

The set $D = \{\langle s, \check{t}\rangle \in \mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}_\eta \mid \max t = \max\operatorname{dom} s\}$ is η-closed. Let $\rho < \eta$ and let $\{\langle s_i, \check{t}_i\rangle \mid i < \rho\} \subset D$ be a decreasing sequence, and assume that $\sup\operatorname{dom} s_i$ is limit ordinal (otherwise, the sequence is fixed from some point). The condition $s_\star, t_\star\rangle$, where $t_\star = \bigcup t_i$ and $s_\star = (\bigcup s_i)^\frown\langle t_\star\rangle$ is a condition in D, stronger than s_i for all i.

The stronger statement, that $\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}^\rho_\eta$ contains a η-closed dense subset (for all $\rho < \mu$), is proved by the same method. □

Let us move now toward the proof of 3. Let $\kappa_0 < \kappa_1 < \cdots < \kappa_n < \cdots$ be supercompact cardinals. By using Laver's preparation, we may assume that they are Laver-indestructible, i.e. that for every $n < \omega$ and every κ_n-directed closed forcing $\mathbb{P}$, $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \check{\kappa_n}$ is supercompact. Let $\mathbb{M} = \prod_{i<\omega} \operatorname{Col}(\kappa_i, < \kappa_{i+1})$ a full support product of Levy collapses.

Lemma 9. *After forcing with $\mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{M}$, the narrow system property holds at λ.*

Proof. Let $H_S \subseteq \mathbb{S}$, $H_M \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be generic filters. Let $G = H_S \times H_M$. Let $H_i \subseteq \mathrm{Col}(\kappa_i, < \kappa_{i+1})$ be the i-th coordinate of the generic filter H_M. Let H^i be the generic filters for all the parts of $\mathbb{M}$ except the i-th coordinate, namely $H^i = \langle H_m \mid m \neq i \rangle$.

Let $\mathcal{S} \in V[G]$ be a narrow system on $I \times \eta$, with relations $\mathcal{R}$. Let us assume, towards a contradiction, that $\mathcal{S}$ has no cofinal branch in $V[G]$. Since the set I will play no role later in the proof, we will restrict ourselves to the notation-wise simpler case in which $I = \lambda$. Let n be large enough such that $\kappa_{n-2} \geq |\eta \times \mathcal{R}|^+$ in $V^{\mathbb{S}\times\mathbb{M}}$.

Let $W_n = V[G][H^n]$. Let us force over W_n with $\mathbb{T}^{\kappa_{n-2}}_{\kappa_n}$. Let $K = \langle K_i \mid i < \kappa_n \rangle$ be the sequence of pairwise mutually generic filters. We stress that the product, $\mathbb{T}^{\kappa_{n-1}}_{\kappa_n}$, is taken over $V[G]$ and not over W_n.

Fix $\xi < \kappa_n$. $W_n[K_\xi] \models \kappa_n$ is supercompact since:

(1) $\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}^{\kappa_{n-2}}_{\kappa_n}$ is κ_n-directed closed,
(2) $\prod_{n \leq i < \omega} \mathrm{Col}(\kappa_i, < \kappa_{i+1})$ is κ_n-directed closed.
(3) $\prod_{i<n-1} \mathrm{Col}(\kappa_i, < \kappa_{i+1})$ has cardinality $< \kappa_n$.

Where we are using the indestructibility in the two first forcings and Levy-Solovay in the last one.

Let $j \colon W_n[K_\xi] \to M$ be a λ-supercompact embedding with critical point κ_n. Since $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa_{n-1}, < \kappa_n)$ is κ_n-c.c., after forcing with

$$\mathrm{Col}(\kappa_{n-1}, j(\kappa_n)) = \mathrm{Col}(\kappa_{n-1}, \kappa_n) \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa_{n-1}, [\kappa_n, j(\kappa_n)))$$

we may extend the elementary embedding j to a λ-supercompact elementary embedding $\tilde{j} \colon W_n[H_n][K_\xi] \to M[\tilde{j}(H_n)]$. Since $W_n[H_n] = V[G][H]$, $S \in W_n[H_n]$, so $\tilde{j}(\mathcal{S})$ is defined.

Let $L = \langle L_i \mid i < \kappa_{n-2} \rangle$ be a generic filter for $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa_{n-1}, [\kappa_n, j(\kappa_n)))^{\kappa_{n-2}}$. Note that the forcing that adds L is κ_{n-1}-closed over the V.

Let $\delta = \sup \tilde{j}''\lambda < \tilde{j}(\lambda)$. Let $\leq_i \in \mathcal{R}$ and let

$$b_{i,\epsilon} = \{\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \mid \tilde{j}(\mathcal{S}) \models \langle j(\alpha), \beta \rangle \leq_i \langle \delta, \epsilon \rangle\}.$$

Since $|\mathcal{R}|, \eta < \kappa_n = \operatorname{crit} \tilde{j}$, for some i, ϵ, $b_{i,\epsilon}$ is a cofinal branch and moreover $\bigcup_{i \in I, \epsilon < \eta} \{\alpha \mid \exists \beta,\ \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \in b_{i,\epsilon}\} = \lambda$.

We say that forcing with $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa_{n-1}, [\kappa_n, j(\kappa_n))) \times \mathbb{T}_{\kappa_n}$ adds a *system of branches* for $\mathcal{S}$.

In particular the forcing $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa_{n-1}, [\kappa_n, < j(\kappa_n)))^{\kappa_{n-2}} \times \mathbb{T}^{\kappa_{n-2}}$ introduces κ_{n-2} many distinct realizations for the system of branches $\{\dot{b}_i \mid i \in I\}$. Note that in order to claim that there is no pair of system of branches which are equal we only used the pairwise mutually genericity.

We conclude that in $V[G][H][K][L]$ there are κ_{n-2} different system of branches. But in this model $\kappa_{n-2} \geq |\eta \times I|^+$ is still regular and $\mathrm{cf}\, \lambda \geq \kappa_{n-1}$. Since for every two realization, and every relation $\leq_i \in \mathcal{R}$, b^α_i, b^β_i split at some point below λ, and since there are only κ_{n-2} realizations and only $|\mathcal{R}|$ relations in $\mathcal{R}$, there is $\rho_\star < \lambda$ such that for every $\xi \geq \rho_\star$, and for every α, β, $b^\alpha_i(\xi) \neq b^\beta(\xi)$ (where it is possible that only one of them is defined). By the Pigeonhole Principle there are $\alpha, \beta < \kappa_{n-2}$ such that $\langle \rho_\star, \xi \rangle \in b^\alpha_i, b^\beta_i$ for the same ξ, i, because there are only $|\mathcal{R}| \times \eta$ many possibilities for this pair. This is a contradiction to the choice of $\rho_\star$. We conclude that it is impossible that there was not cofinal branch in $\mathcal{S}$ in the ground model, as wanted. □

Let $W = V^{\mathbb{S}\times\mathbb{M}}$.

Theorem 10. *There is $\rho < \kappa$ such that forcing with $\mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho^{+\omega}) \times \mathrm{Col}(\rho^{+\omega+1}, < \kappa)$ over W forces the tree property at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$. Further collapsing the new $\aleph_1$ introduces a weak square at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$.*

Proof. Assume otherwise. Let $\mathbb{L}_\rho = \operatorname{Col}(\omega, \rho^{+\omega}) \times \operatorname{Col}(\rho^{+\omega+1}, < \kappa)$. For every $\rho < \kappa$, let $\dot{T}_\rho$, be a $\mathbb{L}_\rho$-name for an Aronszajn tree at λ. Since κ is supercompact, there is $j\colon W \to M$ such that ${}^{\lambda}M \subseteq M$. By our assumption, $M \models j(\mathbb{L})_\kappa \Vdash j(\dot{T})_\kappa$ is an Aronszajn tree. Let $\delta = \sup j''\lambda < j(\lambda)$, and let $t = \langle \delta, 0\rangle$.

Work in M. For every $\alpha < \lambda$, pick a condition $p_\alpha = \langle c_\alpha, q_\alpha\rangle$ such that

$$\exists \zeta < j(\kappa^{+\omega}),\ p_\alpha \Vdash_{j(\mathbb{L}_\kappa)} \langle j(\alpha), \zeta\rangle \leq_{j(\dot{T})_\kappa} \check{t}$$

Let us denote this ζ by ζ_α. We may pick the conditions p_α in a way that q_α is a decreasing sequence. Since λ is regular and $|\operatorname{Col}(\omega, \kappa^{+\omega})| = \kappa^{+\omega} < \lambda$, there is a cofinal set $I \subseteq \lambda$, $n < \omega$ and $c_\star \in \operatorname{Col}(\omega, \kappa^{+\omega})$ such that for every $\alpha \in I$, $c_\alpha = c_\star$ and $\zeta_\alpha < j(\kappa^{+n})$.

By elementariness, for every $\alpha, \beta \in I$, there are $\gamma, \gamma' < \kappa^{+n}$, $\rho < \kappa$ and $p \in \mathbb{L}_\rho$ such that $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{L}_\rho} \langle \alpha, \gamma\rangle \leq_{\dot{T}_\rho} \langle \beta, \gamma'\rangle$.

This defines a narrow system in W: The domain of the system is $I \times \kappa^{+n}$. The indices set is $\bigcup_{\rho<\kappa} \mathbb{L}_\rho \times \{\rho\}$. $\langle \alpha, \xi\rangle \leq_{p,\rho} \langle \beta, \zeta\rangle$ iff $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{L}_\rho} \langle \alpha, \xi\rangle \leq_{\dot{T}_\rho} \langle \beta, \zeta\rangle$.

By the narrow system property there is a cofinal branch in W. Namely there are $\rho < \kappa$, $p \in \mathbb{L}_\rho$ and $\gamma < \kappa^{+n}$ such that for every $\alpha, \beta \in I$, $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{L}_\rho} \langle \alpha, \gamma\rangle \leq \langle \beta, \gamma\rangle$.

This prove that the tree property holds at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ in the generic extension.

For the last claim, note that after collapsing $\aleph_1$, for every $\gamma < \aleph_{\omega+1}$ either $\operatorname{cf}\gamma = \omega$ or $\mathcal{C}_\gamma \neq \emptyset$. Thus, one can complete the partial square to a full $\square_{\aleph_\omega, <\aleph_\omega}$ by adding cofinal ω-sequences. □

4. Indestructible tree property

In this section we will build three models in which the tree property at a successor of singular cardinal is indestructible under certain class of forcing notions. We start by building a model in which the tree property holds at $\aleph_{\omega^2+1}$ and it is indestructible under any forcing $\mathbb{P}$ of cardinality less than $\aleph_{\omega^2}$. Similarly, we will construct a model for the tree property at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ in which the tree property still holds after any σ-closed forcing of cardinality $< \aleph_\omega$.

In the last subsection we will show that it is possible to force the tree property at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ to be indestructible under any $\aleph_{\omega+1}$-closed forcing notions.

4.1. Indestructible Tree Property for $\aleph_{\omega^2+1}$.

In this subsection, we will show that in Sinapova's model for the tree property at $\aleph_{\omega^2+1}$ [6], the tree property is indestructible under small forcings. We start with some simple observations:

Lemma 11. *Let λ be a cardinal such that the tree property holds at λ^+ and it is indestructible by any forcing of the form $\operatorname{Col}(\omega, \mu)$ for $\mu < \lambda$. Then the tree property at λ^+ is indestructible by any forcing of size $< \lambda$. Moreover, it is enough to assume that for every $\mu < \lambda$ there is $\mu \leq \mu' < \lambda$ such that $\operatorname{Col}(\omega, \mu')$ forces the tree property at λ^+.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a forcing notion of cardinality $< \lambda$. Let $\mu = |\mathbb{P}|$. $\operatorname{Col}(\omega, \mu)$ adds a generic filter for $\mathbb{P}$. Let $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ be a generic filter. The quotient forcing $\operatorname{Col}(\omega, \mu)/G$ has cardinality at most μ and therefore it does not add a cofinal branch to any λ^+-Aronszajn tree. Since the tree property holds after forcing with $\operatorname{Col}(\omega, \mu)$ and the forcing $\operatorname{Col}(\omega, \mu)/G$ does not add a branch to Aronszajn tree – the tree property holds in $V[G]$ as well. □

Theorem 12. *Le $t\kappa = \kappa_0 < \kappa_1 < \cdots$ be a sequence of ω supercompact cardinals. Let $\mu = \sup \kappa_n$ and $\lambda = \mu^+$. There is a generic extension in which $\kappa = \aleph_{\omega^2}$, $\lambda = \aleph_{\omega^2+1}$ and for every $\rho < \mu$, the tree property holds after forcing with $\operatorname{Col}(\omega, \rho)$.*

In order to prove this theorem, we will work with Sinapova's model for the tree property at $\aleph_{\omega^2+1}$ from [6]. We will not need to violate SCH at this point, so the proof is somewhat simpler at some points.

The main idea behind the indestructibility is that one can define a projection $f\colon \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{P}$ that shifts the Prikry sequence by one step to the left. This way, we can analyze the sets that were added by a forcing of the form $\mathrm{Col}(\omega, \mu)$ simply by shifting the first element of the Prikry sequence to be above μ. We will show that the quotient forcing between the model $\mathbb{P} * \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \mu)$ and the model $\mathbb{P}$ is λ-centred and therefore cannot add a branch to a λ^+-Aronszajn tree.

We start with a well known fact:

Lemma 13. *Let $\mathbb{M} = \prod_{n<\omega} \mathrm{Col}(\kappa_n, < \kappa_{n+1})$ - a full support product of Levy collapses. In $V^{\mathbb{M}}$ the narrow branch property holds at λ^+.*

The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 9.

Work in $V^{\mathbb{M}}$. $\kappa_0 = \kappa$ is still supercompact, by the Laver indestructibility, so we may pick a normal measure on $P_\kappa\lambda$, $\mathcal{U}$. Let $\mathcal{U}_n$ be the projection of $\mathcal{U}$ to $P_\kappa\kappa_n$ for $n < \omega$.

Let $j_n\colon W \to N_n \cong \mathrm{Ult}(W, \mathcal{U}_n)$ be the elementary embedding derived from $\mathcal{U}_n$. Let us construct a N_n-generic filter H_n for the forcing $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa^{+\omega+2}, < j(\kappa))^{N_n}$. This is possible by the standard arguments: the forcing notion $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa^{+\omega+2}, < j(\kappa))^{N_n}$ is κ^{n+1}-closed in W and has only κ^{+n+1}-dense subsets in N_n.

Let's define the forcing $\mathbb{P}$:

A condition $p \in \mathbb{P}$ has the following form

$$p = \langle d_0, a_0, c_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, A_n, C_n, \dots \rangle$$

where:

(1) $a_i \in P_\kappa\kappa^{+i}$ and $A_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$. Let $\rho_i = a_i \cap \kappa$ if $i < n$ and $\rho_i = \kappa$ otherwise.
(2) $d_0 \in \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho_0^{+\omega})$ if $\rho_0 < \kappa$ and otherwise $d_0 \in \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \kappa)$.
(3) $c_i \in \mathrm{Col}(\rho_i^{+\omega+2}, \rho_{i+1})$
(4) $C_i\colon A_i \to W$ such that $C_i(a) \in \mathrm{Col}((a \cap \kappa)^{+\omega+2}, < \kappa)$ for every $a \in A_i$ and $[C_i]_{\mathcal{U}_i} \in H_i$.

n is called the length of p and we denote $\mathrm{len}(p) = n$.

A condition p is stronger than q ($p \leq q$) if:

(1) $\mathrm{len}(p) \geq \mathrm{len}(q)$
(2) $d_0^p \leq d_0^q$.
(3) $a_i^p = a_i^q$ and $c_i^p \leq c_i^q$ for every $i < \mathrm{len}(q)$.
(4) $a_i^p \in A_i^q$ and $c_i^p \leq C_i^q(a_i)$ for $\mathrm{len}(q) \leq i < \mathrm{len}(p)$
(5) $A_i^p \subseteq A_i^q$ for $i \geq \mathrm{len}(p)$.
(6) $C_i^p(a) \leq C_i^q(a)$ for every $a \in A_i^p$.

Theorem 14 (Sinapova)**.** *$\mathbb{P}$ forces that $\lambda = \aleph_{\omega^2+1}$ and the tree property holds in λ.*

Proof. We will give a sketch of the proof. Let $p \in \mathbb{P}$ be a condition and let $\dot{T}$ be a name for a λ-Aronszajn tree. Let n be the length of p. Let $j\colon V \to M$ be a λ-supercompact embedding, with critical point κ which is compatible with $\mathcal{U}_n$ (namely $\mathcal{U}_n$ is the $P_\kappa\kappa^{+n}$ measure which is derived from j).

In M, let us look at the forcing $j(\mathbb{P})$ below the condition $p^\frown\langle j''\kappa^{+n}\rangle$ (the maximal extension of p that forces that the $n+1$-th element of the diagonal Prikry sequence is $j''\kappa^{+n}$). This forcing preserves λ as a regular cardinal and realizes $j(\dot{T})$ to be a $j(\lambda)$-Aronszajn tree.

Let us denote $\delta = \sup j''\lambda < j(\lambda)$ and let us look at the name of a partial branch $\{\langle j(\alpha), \zeta_\alpha\rangle \mid M^{j(\mathbb{P})} \models \langle j(\alpha), \zeta_\alpha\rangle \leq_{j(\dot{T})} \langle \delta, 0\rangle\}$.

Using the Prikry property, we may find a direct extension of $j(p)$, q, such that for every $\alpha < \lambda$ the value of $n < \omega$ such that $\zeta_\alpha < j(\kappa^{+n})$ is determined by q up to forcing with the first m lower parts of $\mathbb{P}$ ($m < \omega$). Since there are less than λ many possible values for the first m coordinates of the conditions below q, there is a cofinal subset of λ, I, a natural number $n_\star < \omega$ large enough and a fixed lower part $a_\star$ of length $n_\star$ such that

$$I = \{\alpha < \lambda \mid \exists r \leq j(p), \mathrm{stem}(r) = a_\star, r \Vdash \exists \zeta < j(\kappa^{+n_\star}), \langle \alpha, \zeta\rangle \leq \langle \delta, 0\rangle\}.$$

In particular, for every $\alpha, \beta \in I$, M thinks that there is a direct extension of $j(p)$, q and ordinals $\zeta, \zeta' < j(\kappa^{+n_\star})$ such that $q \Vdash \langle j(\alpha), \zeta\rangle \leq_{j(\dot{T})} \langle j(\beta), \zeta'\rangle$. Reflecting this to V we conclude that for every $\alpha, \beta \in I$ there is a condition $q \leq p$ with stem of length n and $\zeta, \zeta' < \kappa^{+n_\star}$ such that $q \Vdash \langle \alpha, \zeta\rangle \leq_{\dot{T}} \langle \beta, \zeta'\rangle$.

This defines a narrow system on $I \times \kappa^{+n_\star}$, indexed by the stems of length n which are stronger than the stem of p. By the narrow system property, there is a cofinal branch. So there is $I' \subseteq I$, a stem $s_\star$ and an ordinal $\zeta_\star < \kappa^{+n_\star}$ such that for every $\alpha < \beta$ in I' there is a condition q with stem $s_\star$ forcing $\langle \alpha, \zeta_\star\rangle \leq_{\dot{T}} \langle \beta, \zeta_\star\rangle$.

Next we will build inductively a sequence of conditions $\langle p_\alpha \mid \alpha \in I' \setminus \rho\rangle$ (for some $\rho < \lambda$), such that for every $\alpha < \beta$,

$$p_\alpha \wedge p_\beta \Vdash \langle \alpha, \zeta_\star\rangle \leq_{\dot{T}} \langle \beta, \zeta_\star\rangle$$

The construction is done by induction on $m < \omega$, where at each step we define $p_\alpha \restriction m$ in a way that for all α, β (except a bounded segment) there is a condition q with $q \restriction m = p_\alpha \restriction m \wedge p_\beta \restriction m$ such that

$$q \Vdash \langle \alpha, \zeta_\star\rangle \leq_{\dot{T}} \langle \beta, \zeta_\star\rangle.$$

Extending $p_\alpha \restriction m$ to $p_\alpha \restriction (m+1)$ is done by defining a narrow system corresponding to the possible extension and using the branch in order to define the relevant value for all $\alpha \in I'$ above the first level that the branch meets.

Eventually, we obtain a sequence of conditions $\{p_\alpha \mid \alpha \in I' \setminus \rho\}$, for some $\rho < \lambda$, $p_\alpha \leq p$. Using the chain condition of the forcing $\mathbb{P}$ we conclude that there is an extension of p that forces that for unbounded many ordinals $\alpha < \lambda$, p_α will be in the generic filter. But then $\{\langle \alpha, \zeta_\star\rangle \mid p_\alpha \in G\}$ is a cofinal branch in $\dot{T}$ (where G is the generic filter for $\mathbb{P}$). □

We will introduce a shifted version of the above forcing. For $s < \omega$, we define the forcing $\mathbb{P}_s$.

A condition $p \in \mathbb{P}_s$ has the following form

$$p = \langle d_0, a_0, c_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, A_n, C_n, \ldots\rangle$$

where:

(1) $a_i \in P_\kappa \kappa^{+i+s}$ and $A_i \in \mathcal{U}_{i+s}$. Let $\rho_i = a_i \cap \kappa$ if $i < n$ and $\rho_i = \kappa$ otherwise.
(2) $d_0 \in \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho_0^{+\omega})$ if $\rho_0 < \kappa$ and otherwise $d_0 \in \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \kappa)$.
(3) $c_i \in \mathrm{Col}(\rho_i^{+\omega+2}, \rho_{i+1})$
(4) $C_i \colon P_\kappa \kappa^{+i+s} \to W$ such that $C_i(a) \in \mathrm{Col}((a \cap \kappa)^{+\omega+2}, < \kappa)$ for every $a \in A_i$ and $[C_i]_{\mathcal{U}_{i+s}} \in H_{i+s}$.

We order the conditions in the same way as we did for $\mathbb{P}$.

The proof of Theorem 14 still works without change and we conclude that:

Theorem 15. *For every $s < \omega$, $\mathbb{P}_s$ forces $\lambda = \aleph_{\omega^2+1}$ and the tree property holds at λ*

In order to show the indestructibility, we need to show that there is a simple connection between the different shifts of the forcing:

Lemma 16. *Let $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $\mathrm{len}(p) = n + 1$, $n \geq 1$. There is a condition q, of length one such that $\rho_0^q = \rho_n^p$, and a projection $\pi \colon \mathbb{P}_n / q \to \mathbb{P} \times \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho_n^{+\omega})$.*

Proof. Let $\eta = \rho_n^p$.

First, let us note that $\mathbb{P}/p$ is the product of $\mathbb{C} = \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho_0^\omega) \times \prod_{i<n} \mathrm{Col}(\rho_i^{+\omega+2}, < \rho_{i+1})$ and the forcing $\mathbb{P}^{\geq n}$ which is the set of n-upper part of the conditions of $\mathbb{P}$. Namely $p \in \mathbb{P}^{\geq n}$ if $p = \langle a_n, c_n, \dots a_{l-1}, c_{l-1}, A_l, C_l, \dots \rangle$, $l \geq n$ and a_i, c_i, A_i, C_i are as above.

Since $|\mathbb{C}| = \rho_n \leq \rho_n^\omega = \eta$, the forcing $\mathrm{Col}(\omega, \eta)$ projects onto $\mathbb{C} \times \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \eta)$. Let π_0 be the projection.

Let $r = \langle d_0, a_0, c_0 \dots \rangle \in \mathbb{P}_n$, $r \leq q$. So $d_0 \in \mathrm{Col}(\omega, (\rho_0^q)^{+\omega})$ but $\rho_0^q = \rho_n^p$ so $d_0 \in \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \eta)$. Let $\pi(r)$ be

$$\pi_0(r)^\frown \langle a_0, c_0, a_1, c_1, \dots \rangle \in \mathbb{P} \times \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \eta)$$

Clearly, π is a projection. □

Lemma 17. *Let G be a generic filter for $\mathbb{P} \times \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \eta)$ above p. The separative quotient of the quotient forcing $\{r \in \mathbb{P}_n/q \mid \pi(r) \in G\}$ is equivalent to a forcing of cardinality η.*

Proof. The lemma follows from the representation of $\mathbb{P} \restriction p$ and $\mathbb{P}_s \restriction q$ as a product. □

Theorem 18. *$\mathbb{P}$ forces the tree property at $\aleph_{\omega^2+1}$ to be indestructible by any forcing of size $< \aleph_{\omega^2}$.*

Proof. Is it enough to show that it is the case for $\mathrm{Col}(\omega, \aleph_{\omega \cdot n})$. Recall that $\aleph_{\omega \cdot n} = \rho_n^{+\omega}$ so we are in the situation of Lemma 17. This means that after forcing with $\mathrm{Col}(\omega, \aleph_{\omega \cdot n})$ there is a further forcing $\mathbb{R}$ that restores the tree property (as the iteration is equivalent to forcing with $\mathbb{P}_n$ above some condition). But $|\mathbb{R}| = \aleph_{\omega \cdot n}$ is a small forcing so it can't add a branch to an Aronszajn tree. So every $\aleph_{\omega^2+1}$-tree in the universe after forcing with $\mathrm{Col}(\omega, \aleph_{\omega n})$ must have a branch. □

4.2. **Indestructible Tree property for $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ under small σ-closed forcings.** Let us construct a model very similar to subsection 4.1, in which we have the tree property at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ and it will be indestructible under any σ-closed forcing of cardinality $< \aleph_\omega$. The additional restriction on the forcing notions (namely that we require the forcing to be σ-closed), implies that those forcing notions cannot collapse ω_1.

Theorem 19. *It is consistent, relative to the existence of ω many supercompact cardinals, that the tree property holds at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ and it is indestructible under any σ-closed forcing of cardinality $< \aleph_\omega$.*

Proof. We will start with a model of the narrow system property at $\kappa^{+\omega+1}$ for κ a supercompact cardinal. This can be obtained, for example, by forcing with the product of the Levy collapses between the supercompact cardinals as in Lemma 13. Let $\mathcal{U}_0$ be a normal ultrafilter on κ generated from a $\kappa^{+\omega+1}$-supercompact elementary embedding, $j \colon V \to M$.

Let us show that for every $n < \omega$, there is a large set $A_n \in \mathcal{U}_0$ such that for every $\rho \in A_n$, forcing with $\mathbb{L}_\rho = \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho^{+\omega}) \times \mathrm{Col}(\rho^{+\omega+1}, \kappa^{+n})$ forces the tree property at $\kappa^{+\omega+1}$.

Assume that this is not the case and let $\dot{T}_\rho$ be a counterexample for every "bad choice" of ρ, for a fixed $n < \omega$. Since the set of bad choices is in $\mathcal{U}_0$, κ is a bad choice of ordinal in M. Let us force with $j(\mathbb{L})_\kappa$, and let $M[H]$ be the generic extension. Let $T = j(\dot{T})^H_\kappa$ be an Aronszajn tree at $j(\kappa^{\omega+1})$. Let $\delta = \sup j'' \kappa^{+\omega+1}$ and for every $\alpha < \kappa^{+\omega+1}$ let $\beta_\alpha < j(\kappa^{+\omega})$ be the element in the level $j(\alpha)$ below $\langle \delta, 0 \rangle$.

Using the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 10, there is a cofinal set $I \subseteq \kappa^{+\omega+1}$, a decreasing sequence of conditions $q_\alpha \in \mathrm{Col}(\kappa^{+\omega+1}, j(\kappa)^{+n})$, a

condition $p \in \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \kappa^{+\omega})$ and a natural number $N < \omega$ such that for every $\alpha \in I$ there is $\beta < j(\kappa^{+N})$ such that $(p, q_\alpha) \Vdash \langle j(\alpha), \beta\rangle \leq_T \langle \delta, 0\rangle$.

Reflecting this back to V, we conclude that for every $\alpha, \alpha' \in I$:

$$\exists \beta, \beta' < \kappa^{+N},\ \rho < \kappa,\ p \in \mathbb{L}_\rho \text{ such that } p \Vdash_{\mathbb{L}_\rho} \langle \alpha, \beta\rangle \leq_{T_\rho} \langle \alpha', \beta'\rangle.$$

This gives us a narrow system, similar to the one in the proof of Theorem 10. A branch through this system provides us an ordinal ρ which was a bad choice, a condition $r \in \mathbb{L}_\rho$, a cofinal set $J \subseteq I$ and for all $\alpha \in J$ an ordinal $\beta_\alpha < \kappa^{+N}$ such that for all $\alpha, \alpha' \in J$,

$$r \Vdash_{\mathbb{L}_\rho} \langle \alpha, \beta_\alpha\rangle, \langle \alpha', \beta_{\alpha'}\rangle \text{ are compatible.}$$

This is a contradiction to the fact that this $\dot{T}_\rho$ was a name for an λ-Aronszajn tree.

Let $A = \bigcup_{n<\omega} A_n$ and let $\rho \in A$. Forcing with $\mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho^{+\omega}) \times \mathrm{Col}(\rho^{+\omega+1}, \kappa)$ forces the tree property. For every small σ-closed forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}$ there is n such that $\mathrm{Col}(\rho^{+\omega+1}, \kappa) * \mathbb{Q}$ is a regular subforcing of $\mathrm{Col}(\rho^{+\omega+1}, \kappa^{+n})$ and since the tree property holds after this forcing and since the quotient is small and thus cannot add branches to Aronszajn trees - we are done. □

4.3. **Indestructible Tree Property at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ under closed forcings.**

Theorem 20. *Assume that $\langle \kappa_n \mid n < \omega\rangle$ is a sequence of supercompact cardinals. There is a generic extension in which the tree property holds at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ and it is indestructible under any $\aleph_{\omega+1}$-closed forcing.*

Proof. Let $\lambda = (\sup_{n<\omega} \kappa_n)^+$.

We would like to force with the iteration

$$\mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho) * \mathrm{Col}(\rho^+, < \kappa_0) * \mathrm{Col}(\kappa_0, < \kappa_1) * \cdots * \mathrm{Col}(\lambda, \mu)$$

and show that for every $\mu \geq \lambda$ there is $\rho < \kappa_0$ such that this iteration forces the tree property at λ. Then, we claim that for many values of μ, the same ρ works and conclude that in this case, the iteration

$$\mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho) * \mathrm{Col}(\rho^+, < \kappa_0) * \mathrm{Col}(\kappa_0, < \kappa_1) * \cdots * \mathrm{Col}(\kappa_m, < \kappa_{m+1}) * \cdots$$

force the tree property at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ in an indestructible way.

We know that the claim holds when we use product instead of iteration. In this case, the arguments of Neeman shows that for all $\mu \geq \lambda$ there is $\rho < \kappa_0$ such that the forcing with ρ forces the tree property. Luckily, there is a natural projection from the product onto the iteration. The termspace forcing for each component in the iteration contains a dense subset in which every element is a partial function from the domain of the collapse into names of ordinals below the the range of the collapse. Using the chain condition of the components, the number of names of ordinals is the same as the number of ordinals in each component.

So, in order to pull all of this together, we need to know that the quotient forcing of the product modulo the iteration cannot add a branch to a λ-Aronszajn tree.

The following lemma will show that this is indeed the case:

Lemma 21. *Let λ_n, $n < \omega$ be an increasing sequence of regular cardinals, $\mu = \sup \lambda_n$, $\lambda = \mu^+$. Denote $\lambda_{-1} = \omega$.*

Let $\mathbb{P}_n$ be a $\mathbb{P}_0 * \cdots \mathbb{P}_{n-1}$-name for a λ_{n-1}-forcing notion of cardinality $\leq \lambda_n$. $\mathbb{P}_\omega$ is a $\mathbb{P}_0 * \cdots * \mathbb{P}_n * \cdots$-name for a λ-closed forcing (the iteration is with full support). Let $\mathbb{Q}_n$ be a λ_{n-1}-forcing notion of cardinality $\leq \lambda_n$, and $\mathbb{Q}_\omega$ a λ-closed forcing notion.

Assume that for all $n < \omega$, there is a projection $\pi_n \colon \mathbb{Q}_n \to \mathbb{P}_n$ in $V^{\mathbb{P}_0 * \cdots * \mathbb{P}_{n-1}}$ and there is $\pi_\omega \colon \mathbb{Q}_\omega \to \mathbb{P}_\omega$ in the generic extension by $\mathbb{P}_0 * \cdots \mathbb{P}_n * \cdots$.

Let $\mathbb{Q} = \prod_{n\leq\omega} \mathbb{Q}_n$ and let $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_0 * \cdots * \mathbb{P}_n * \cdots * \mathbb{P}_\omega$, both with full support. Let $\pi \colon \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{P}$ be the corresponding projection and let $\mathbb{R}$ be the quotient forcing.

Assume that π is σ-continuous. Namely, that if $p_n \leq \pi(q_n)$ in $\mathbb{P}$, p_n, q_n are decreasing and there are limits $p_\omega \leq \bigwedge p_n$, $q_\omega \leq \bigwedge q_n$ then $p_\omega \leq \pi(q_\omega)$.

Let T be a λ-tree in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$. Then $\mathbb{R}$ does not add a branch to T.

Proof. Assume otherwise, and let $\dot{b}$ be a $\mathbb{R}$-name for a new branch.

Let us define by induction conditions $p_n \in \mathbb{P}, q_\eta \in \mathbb{Q}$ for all $n < \omega$, $\eta \in \bigcup_{n<\omega} \prod_{m<n} \lambda_m$ and ordinals $\zeta_\alpha < \lambda$ such that:

(1) $p_n \Vdash q_\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $\operatorname{len}\eta < n$.
(2) $n < m$ implies $p_m \leq p_n$.
(3) For $\alpha < \beta < \lambda_n$ and $\eta \in \prod_{m<n} \lambda_m$,
$$\langle p_{n+1}, q_\alpha\rangle \Vdash \dot{b}(\zeta_\beta) = \dot{x}, \langle p_{n+1}, q_\beta\rangle \Vdash \dot{b}(\zeta_\beta) = \dot{y} \text{ and } p_{n+1} \Vdash \dot{x} \neq \dot{y}.$$
(4) For all $m \geq n$, $p_m \restriction n = p_n \restriction n$. For all $\eta \trianglelefteq \eta'$, $q_\eta \geq q_{\eta'}$ and $q_\eta \restriction (\operatorname{len}(\eta) - 2) = q_{\eta'} \restriction (\operatorname{len}(\eta) - 2)$.

The induction works since for every $n < \omega$, one can construct a decreasing sequence of conditions $\tilde{p}_\alpha \leq p_n$, $\alpha < \lambda_n$, with fixed first n coordinates such that for every $\alpha, \beta < \lambda_n$ and $\eta \in \prod_{m<n} \lambda_m$ one can find for every possible extension of the lower n-part of $\tilde{p}_\alpha$, $q_{\eta^\frown\langle\alpha\rangle}, q_{\eta^\frown\langle\beta\rangle}$ a further extension in which $q_{\eta^\frown\langle\alpha\rangle}, q_{\eta^\frown\langle\beta\rangle}$ force contradictory information on the branch. Using the closure of the forcing notions and the limitation on their sizes, this can be done. We take p_{n+1} to be a lower bound of $\tilde{p}_\alpha$ for all $\alpha < \lambda_n$.

In the end of the process, we have a condition $p_\omega, \forall n < \omega, p_\omega \leq p_n$ (well defined, since all but maybe $\mathbb{P}_0$ are σ-closed and we fix the first coordinate).

Using the closure of the upper coordinates of $\mathbb{Q}$, for all $\eta \in \prod_{n<\omega} \lambda_n$, there is $q_\eta \in \mathbb{Q}$ which is stronger than $q_{\eta\restriction n}$ for all $n < \omega$. Let us show that $p_\omega \Vdash q_\eta \in \mathbb{R}$. This is true by our assumption that π is σ-continuous.

Finally, q_η, $\eta \in \prod_{n<\omega} \lambda_n$ define a set of $|\prod \lambda_n|$ many incompatible evaluations for $\dot{b}$ at bounded point of the tree - a contradiction. □

Let us return to the proof of the theorem.

Let $\mathbb{P}_n$ be the n-th collapse in the iteration and $\mathbb{Q}_n$ be the n-th collapse in the product. It is well known that there are projections $\pi_n \colon \mathbb{Q}_n \to \mathbb{P}_n$ as required (defined by identifying the collapse forcing in the product with the termspace forcing for the n-th step of the iteration). Therefore, it is enough to show that for all μ there is ρ such that the product $\operatorname{Col}(\omega, \rho) \times \operatorname{Col}(\rho^+, < \kappa_0) \times \prod \operatorname{Col}(\kappa_m, < \kappa_{m+1}) \times \operatorname{Col}(\lambda, \mu)$ forces the tree property.

Lemma 22. *Let $\mu \geq \lambda$. There is $\rho < \kappa_0$ such that the forcing*
$$\mathbb{M} = \operatorname{Col}(\omega, \rho) \times \operatorname{Col}(\rho^+, < \kappa) \times \prod_m \operatorname{Col}(\kappa_m, \kappa_{m+1}) \times \operatorname{Col}(\lambda, \mu)$$
forces the tree property at λ.

Proof. For all n, κ_n is indestructible supercompact. Thus, we can start by forcing with $\operatorname{Col}(\lambda, \mu)$, and work in $W = V^{\operatorname{Col}(\lambda,\mu)}$ in which still for every $n < \omega$, the cardinal κ_n is indestructible supercompact. In W, we apply Neeman's proof and conclude that there is $\rho < \kappa_0$ such that $\operatorname{Col}(\omega, \rho) \times \operatorname{Col}(\rho^+, < \kappa) \times \prod_m \operatorname{Col}(\kappa_m, \kappa_{m+1})$ forces the tree property at λ. □

Combining those two lemmas, for every $\mu \geq \lambda$ there is $\rho < \kappa_0$ such that forcing with $\mathbb{L}_\rho * \operatorname{Col}(\lambda, \mu)$, where
$$\mathbb{L}_\rho = \operatorname{Col}(\omega, \rho) * \operatorname{Col}(\rho^+, < \kappa_0) * \operatorname{Col}(\kappa_0, < \kappa_1) * \cdots$$
will force the tree property at λ. For class many values of μ, the same ρ works. Let us call the elements of this class the *good* cardinals. Let $\rho_\star$ be this value and let us force with $\mathbb{L}_{\rho_\star}$.

Now, let $\mathbb{P}$ be a λ-closed forcing in $V^{\mathbb{L}_{\rho_\star}}$. There is μ large enough which is good and such that there is a projection from $\mathrm{Col}(\lambda,\mu)$ onto $\mathbb{P}$. Since the tree property holds at λ in $V^{\mathbb{L}_{\rho_\star}*\mathrm{Col}(\lambda,\mu)}$ and the quotient forcing $\mathrm{Col}(\lambda,\mu)/\mathbb{P}$ cannot add a branch to an Aronszajn tree - the tree property holds at λ in $V^{\mathbb{L}_{\rho_\star}*\mathbb{P}}$ as well. □

5. Open questions

In Section 4.1 we proved that the tree property at $\aleph_{\omega^2+1}$ can be made indestructible under any small forcing poset.

Question 1. Is it consistent that the tree property at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is indestructible under any forcing of cardinality $< \aleph_\omega$?

On the other hand, one can ask whether it is possible to extend the results of Theorem 3.

Question 2. Is it consistent that the tree property holds at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ but there is a small forcing (of cardinality $< \aleph_\omega$), that does not collapse cardinals and adds an Aronszajn tree?

Note that in all the currently known models for the tree property at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$, adding a single Cohen real does not add Aronszajn tree at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$. So we ask the following stronger version of Question 2:

Question 3. Is it consistent that the tree property holds at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ but there adding a Cohen real adds an Aronszajn tree?

This question is particularly interesting when we assume that $\aleph_\omega$ is strong limit since then adding a Cohen real cannot add a weak square for $\aleph_\omega$.

References

[1] Shai Ben-David and Saharon Shelah, *Souslin trees and successors of singular cardinals*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **30** (1986), no. 3, 207–217. MR 836425 (87h:03078)

[2] James Cummings, Matthew Foreman, and Menachem Magidor, *Squares, scales and stationary reflection*, J. Math. Log. **1** (2001), no. 1, 35–98. MR 1838355 (2003a:03068)

[3] Menachem Magidor and Sharon Shelah, *The tree property at successors of singular*, Archive for Mathematical Logic (1996), 385–404.

[4] Itay Neeman, *The tree property up to* $\aleph_{\omega+1}$, J. Symb. Log. **79** (2014), no. 2, 429–459. MR 3224975

[5] Assaf Rinot, *A cofinality-preserving small forcing may introduce a special Aronszajn tree*, Arch. Math. Logic **48** (2009), no. 8, 817–823. MR 2563820 (2011i:03042)

[6] Dima Sinapova, *The tree property and the failure of the singular cardinal hypothesis at* $\aleph_{\omega^2}$, Journal of Simbolic Logic **77** (2012), 729–1056.